



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,775	04/28/2006	Tae-Yoon Kim	0070777-000021	9809

21839 7590 07/07/2009
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

MONSHIPOURI, MARYAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1656

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/07/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/577,775	Applicant(s) KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner Maryam Monshipouri	Art Unit 1656	

All Participants:

(1) Maryam Monshipouri.

(2) Ms. Susan Dadio.

Date of Interview: 15 June 2009

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
102/103

Claims discussed:
7, 24

Prior art documents discussed:
US Patent No. 6,011,067

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

On 6/15/09 Ms. Lisa Stall called the examiner to indicate that the interview summary mentioned in the office action of 6/9/09 was not received by applicant. The examiner expressed regret for the inadvertent error and promised Ms. Stall to send applicant a summary of Ms. Dadio's communications with the examiner as following:

On 6/9/09 the examiner called Ms. Dadio to suggest ways to amend base claim 7 such that it would overcome the cited art (see above Patent, cited previously)t) and mentioned that claim 24 as written is not allowable. However, during the course of interview both the examiner and applicant reached the conclusion that a new office action is nescessary.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Maryam Monshipouri/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

